

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Little Snake Field Office
455 Emerson Street
Craig, CO 81625

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: CO-100-2006-026 DNA

APPLICANT: Samson Resources Company

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: : COC69197 (Chapman State 13-16)
COC69199 (State of Colorado 32-16)

PROJECT NAME: Two pipelines for Samson's four wells in section 16

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T.11N., R.97W., section 16, Moffat County, Colorado.
COC69197, section 16, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$; section 17, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, 6th PM, Moffat
County, Colorado.
COC69199, section 16, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, 6th PM,
Moffat County, Colorado.

APPLICANT: Samson Resources Company

A. Describe the Proposed Action

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Little Snake Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: April 26, 1989

- Draft RMP/EIS February 1986
- Final RMP/EIS September 1986
- Colorado Oil and Gas Leasing and Development Final EIS January 1991
-

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

CO-100-2005-052EA

Colorado Public Land Health Standards, Decision Record & Finding of No Significant

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document? Yes.

The proposed action is specifically identified in the Little Snake Field Office NEPA document CO-100-2005-052. The proposed actions will plan the pipelines in the access roads ROWs which were issued with the wells. The proposed action is essentially the same as the previous proposed action.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values? Yes.

There has been no significant change in circumstances or significant new information germane to the proposed action. The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are not significantly different than those identified in the existing documents. A reasonable range of alternatives was analyzed in the existing document.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances? Yes.

Circumstances have not significantly changed from EA CO-100-2005-052. Samson is placing the pipelines in the access road rights-of-way.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action? Yes.

The methodology/analytical approach previously used is appropriate for the proposed action as all resources were addressed.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Yes.

The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are not significantly different than those identified in the existing document.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes.

No change in the cumulative impacts are foreseen.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes.

The proposed pipelines analyzed in the mentioned EA did not receive any public comment either negative or positive.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

- See the EACO-100-2005-52 for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original NEPA documents.

Name Name/Date	Title	Resource Represented
Barb Blackstun	Natural Resource Specialist	Air Quality & Climate, Floodplains, Prime/Unique Farmlands, Surface Water Quality BB 02/07/06
Hal Keesling	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, HSK Native American Concerns 2/14/06
Phillis Bowers	Realty Specialist	Environmental Justice PAB 2/2/06
Duane Johnson	Environmental Coord. NEPA	Hazardous Materials DJ 2/7/06
Curtis Bryan	Rangeland Management Spec.	Invasive Non-native Species CJB2/8/06
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Spec.	Sensitive Plants, T&E Plant JHS 2/3/06
Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Animal DA 2/16/06
Fred Conrath	Petroleum Geologist	Ground Water Quality FC 2/14/06
Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands/Riparian Zones DA 2/16/06
Jim McBrayer	Outdoor Recreation Specialist	WSA, W&S Rivers JDM 2/14/06

STANDARDS:

Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	Animal, Riparian Systems DA 2/16/06
Curtis Bryan	Rangeland Management Spec	Plant CJB 02/08/06
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Spec	T&E Plant JHS 2/3/06

Desa Ausmus

Wildlife Biologist

T&E Animal

DA 2/16/06

Barb Blackstun

Natural Resource Specialist

Water Quality, Upland Soil BB 2/07/06

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Signature of Lead Specialist_____

Date_____

Signature of NEPA Coordinator_____

Date_____

Signature of the Authorizing Official_____

Date_____

Note: The signed Conclusion on this document is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

DATE SIGNED: 03/03/06